HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JAN 27 1916
TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

The Protestant Review

(Formerly The Converted Catholic)

Volume XXXIII, Number 1
January, 1916

Nathan and the Pope.

THE ADDRESS OF SIGNOR NATHAN,

ex-Mayor of Rome, which has enraged the pope and has excited American Romanists to Boycott the Panama Exposition.

THE POPE'S UNPRECEDENTED REPLY.

SIGNOR NATHAN'S REJOINDER.

32 PAGES. PRICE TEN CENTS A COPY.

Why must We Fight the Roman Church?

By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"An admirable address."—The Guardian of Liberty.

The President and the "Pan-American" Political Thanksgiving Mass,

By the Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred,

"A powerful pamphlet."—The Guardian of Liberty.

"Ought to be written in golden letters and posted on every door of the whole White House; . . . ought to be sent to every senator, congressman, preacher and editor in this land."—P. A. Seguin, ex-priest and author.

"The best thing I have seen in a long time, and I read most all of the patriotic papers."—V. L. W.

4515
19

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The Protestant Review

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE
Published by
CHRIST'S MISSION
EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.
Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.
MANUEL FERRANDO, Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street, NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXIII. JANUARY, 1916. No. 1.

CONTENTS

	Page
Faith (Poem)	2
Editorial Notes.—The Protestant Review	3
" " The Catholic Party in the Episcopal Church and the Panama Congress (Continued)	4
Poisoned Wells (concluded). By Alsa Lorraine	12
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XLVI. By Manuel Ferrando	17
Rome in Politics. Maneuvering for Presidential Campaign—Gloved Hand of Papacy Seen in Location of National Conventions. By Staff Correspondent of Free Press Defense League, Washington, D. C.	24
What a Jesuit Says and What He Does Not Say. The Editor	27
Six Hundred Unhappy Homes. The Sentinel	31
Catholicism Our National Peril. By W. A. Chandler, Bishop M. E. Church, Atlanta, Ga.	32

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year.....$1.50
Single copy 15
Ten copies to one address, per year, each 1.25

To Ministers and Missionaries....$1.00
Twenty or more copies, each..... 10
Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each 1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Protestant Review, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date of the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

FAITH

I will not doubt, though all my ships at sea
Come drifting home with broken masts and sails;
I will believe the Hand which never fails,
From seeming evil worketh good for me.
And though I weep because those sails are tattered,
Still will I cry, while my best hopes lie shattered:
"I trust in Thee."

I will not doubt, though all my prayers return
Unanswered from the still, white realm above;
I will believe it is an all-wise love
Which has refused these things for which I yearn;
And though at times I cannot keep from grieving,
Yet the pure ardor of my fixed believing
Undimmed shall burn.

I will not doubt, though sorrows fall like rain,
And troubles swarm like bees about a hive;
I will believe the heights for which I strive
Are only reached by anguish and by pain;
And though I groan and writhe beneath my crosses,
I yet shall see through my severest losses
The greater gain.

I will not doubt. Well anchored is this faith.
Like some staunch ship, my soul braves every gale;
So strong its courage that it will not quail
To breast the mighty unknown sea of death.
Oh, may I cry, though body parts with spirit,
"I do not doubt!" so listening worlds may hear it,
With my last breath! —Selected.

TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
JAN 27 1916
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Gift of
The Publisher

The

Protestant Review

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."
(1 Cor. 16: 13.)

Vol. XXXIII JANUARY, 1916 No. 1

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE PROTESTANT REVIEW

With the present number we begin the thirty-third year of the history of our magazine. Our friends will notice a change of name, but no change in policy or character. Our worthy predecessor, the Rev. J. A. O'Connor, its founder, held unchangeable principles which we feel proud to follow. The usefulness of the magazine as an enlightener of many during the long years of its existence is vouched for by the numerous testimonials we have in our possession from readers whose warm appreciation is a great encouragement in the work. Its object, as given by its founder, was to defend the principles of Christianity against the encroachments of the Roman Church. This we also try to do. Its purpose has been to "tell the truth in love," and it is our endeavor to do likewise. The founder of the magazine was prompted to publish it by love; he never intended to open a campaign of bitterness and recrimination against the Church of his youth. His great heart could never nourish hatred. He felt a burning desire for the salvation of souls and the defense of his country, and he saw that the only way was to tell the truth boldly and fearlessly, yet in a spirit of charity; and he did not deviate from this principle an iota during his long, useful life.

In this respect the magazine needs no change. It does not admit of any improvement as to principle, and it shall be our aim to be faithful to its principles and history, as long as we have charge of its editorship.

It has been thought wise, however, to change its name from THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC to THE PROTESTANT REVIEW, the reason the managers have for this change being a very simple one.

Its founder once said that when he chose the name he had it in mind to make of the magazine an organ whereby he might

reach with his personal testimony to the truth those he could not reach through his public lectures, which no secular paper would report. So the name implied that it was the voice of one who knew what he was talking about, because he was a convert from Romanism. When he saw that the scope of the magazine had grown beyond his expectations, he began to consider changing its name, and to that effect, a few months before he died, he wrote to several of his friends and supporters, asking their advice in the choice of a new name. The Trustees, in making the change, therefore, feel that they are simply carrying out the wishes of the founder.

The selection of a suitable title has not been an easy matter, but it seems that the one now fixed upon best suggests the scope of the publication and its purpose.

We hope our readers will welcome their old friend under its new name as kindly and warmly as ever, and that each one will help to add new subscribers to our list.

THE CATHOLIC PARTY IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

And the Panama Congress

(Continued.)

With regard to the question of the so-called Panama Congress, I must say that I am just as much opposed to it as Dr. Manning and the rest of the Catholic party can be, but the grounds for our protest against it are quite the opposite of each other.

Unfortunately, to quote from "The Sentinel," of Toronto, "some people who call themselves Protestants have a curious idea that no effort should be made by Protestant missionary organizations to evangelize the Roman Catholics.

"Why should not the Protestant Churches send their missionaries to Roman Catholic countries? Roman Catholic missionaries go to the most outstanding Protestant communities with the purpose of proselytizing. In the city of Toronto the Paulist Fathers have just finished a mission at St. Joseph's Church. The purpose of this mission was of course to convert Protestants to Romanism.

If that is right, why should we be debarred from sending missionaries to Romanist communities?

"There may be some Protestants who really believe that Romanism is a Christian faith; but there are no Roman Catholics who will admit that the Protestant Church is a Christian body. All the concessions are upon one side. Romanists will not tolerate anything but Rome."

What has been said of Toronto is equally true of New York and other cities in the United States, and also in England and Germany. It has been said that the object of the Roman Church is to care for the spiritual needs of its own adherents in this country and other Protestant lands, but this is not the case. For such a purpose the Church has its parish priests, subjected to the jurisdiction of the bishop and forming with him a pastoral body. But the presence of any religious order means proselytizing, as they do not form part of the pastoral body of the Church, but are considered as soldiers or conquerors for the extension of the Church, to convert heretics and then turn them over to the bishop and parish priest for pastoral care. We have in New York the Paulist Fathers, whose object is exclusively to convert Protestants, and they are holding missions everywhere. In England there are special houses to which the Jesuits personally invite Protestant ministers to go, and where lectures upon Roman Catholic doctrine are given for them alone.

The attitude assumed by Dr. Manning and the four other High Churchmen who resigned from the Board of Missions of the Episcopal Church, after fighting strenuously to prevent the sending of delegates to the Panama Congress, is not, however, that of over-tolerant Protestants. They assume the name of "Catholic," and their point of view is expressed by Bishop Weller in the following remarkable statement:

"Such action by the Board, if carried out, would create between us and the Church of Rome an unfathomable chasm which God only can close. . . . I regard this Panama Conference as a direct attack by one part of Christendom upon another. . . . We are here to say that we will not make such an attack, and will not let you attack. We have to fight. One part of Christendom is not going to war with another branch, while the heathen are unconverted. I say here that we will not join in fighting against

another part of Christendom. *We will rather walk on the other side of the line!* I want to say to you candidly that when it comes to joining with Protestants against Roman Catholicism, there are some of us here, if you make us, who would take our place on the other side." He insisted that the Board rescind its action of last May, instead of sending delegates.

Bishop Weller's position is utterly wrong and untenable, and we are very sorry to see a man occupying such a high place in the Protestant Episcopal Church so destitute of logic and common sense. His attitude also reveals a great disregard for the principles he stands for within a Church having fixed and established tenets. His confession puts him outside of that Church altogether and makes his position equivocal; and for the sake of honesty, if for no other reason, he should go where he belongs. He ought not to pose as a bishop at all. That honor has been conferred upon him by a Church to which he does not morally belong, and the Church which is evidently his preference and admiration does not even recognize his ordination!

Not only is the position of Bishop Weller, Dr. Manning and the rest a false and unworthy one, but, as we pointed out at some length last month, it is most ridiculous in the eyes of Romanists.

I have at hand a copy of "The Catholic World" for January, and a few paragraphs from its section, "With Our Readers," will amply confirm all I have said on the way Catholics look upon the pretensions of the Ritualists.

Speaking of "those members of the Episcopal Church who call themselves members of the Catholic party, and endeavor to console themselves with the notion that they are in some way members of the Catholic Church," "The Catholic World" goes on to say: "If we suppose that a meeting were held to-day of all the bishops of what they are pleased to include under the title Catholic Church, it is beyond question that their appeal would be denied; they would first be called upon to recognize and to submit to that See, obedience to which has been the test of Catholicism since the world knew Christianity.

"In all truth, as soon as a member of the Episcopal Church reflects on his assumption that he is a member of the Catholic Church and asks himself the justification of it, he is unable to give anything like a satisfactory answer. Times without num-

ber have theories been formulated to support the contention of the Catholic party in the Anglican and Episcopal Churches, but as soon as they are brought into the presence of facts they wither away. Why is the position of a member of the Episcopal Church more Catholic than that of a Baptist or Methodist or Presbyterian? The protest of the prominent officials and members of the Episcopal Church against the action of the Board of Missions that approved the sending of delegates to the Panama Congress is based on the supposition that they are more Catholic; that is, they are members of the true Church of Christ and logically cannot affiliate with the religious work of Protestant Churches. How do they justify such a position? Just as often as they have attempted a justification, just so often have they failed. . . .

"Those who are looking for the true Catholic faith in the Episcopal Church . . . are asking water of a well which has long since run dry."

Dr. Manning may be under an entirely different impression as to the opinion in which he is held by Romanists, if, as I have no doubt, he has been approached more than once by the Jesuits; and no Jesuit would endorse the policy of the editor of "The Catholic World." This magazine is edited by the Paulist Fathers, and Jesuits and Paulists have always been at swords' points as to policy. But I can assure Dr. Manning that if the Jesuits, or any one else, tell him anything different from what we have quoted, they tell him a lie, with the intention of deceiving him, so as to bring about in some way a split in the Protestant Episcopal Church. "The Catholic World" expresses, and in a mild way, the true attitude of the Roman Church toward the pretensions of the Catholic party in the Protestant Episcopal Church. If Dr. Manning or Bishop Weller think that, should they go to the Roman Church, they would be regarded with any more distinction than a lay member of the Baptist, or Methodist, or any other Protestant denomination, they are greatly mistaken.

But if this aping of Romanism by the Ritualists is treated by the ecclesiastics of the Roman Church with contemptuous ridicule and sarcasm, the feeling is one of antagonism and odium when it comes to the ignorant classes of that Church. Some practical cases will prove this.

In a South American city different denominations are doing missionary work. There is also a Protestant Episcopal clergyman stationed there, not to do missionary work among the natives, but simply to minister to his own people and those who may come voluntarily to him; or, as it was expressed to me once, "We do not seek converts, but we receive those who come to us."

The other denominations referred to are faithful to their direct Gospel preaching, while the Episcopal Church is introducing candles, the High Church ritual, etc., and the rector strictly follows the ingratiating policy toward Rome recommended by the Catholic party. While never, or very rarely, have the meetings of the other denominations been disturbed by any one, the Episcopal services have been several times disturbed and even stones thrown in at the windows. And I know of another case where people broke in and stole the pictures and the cross from an Episcopal Church. Why is this? We know that it is the just and logical penalty inflicted upon the man who does not stand up for his principles. The traitor has always been regarded with contempt.

But this, for the Spanish mind, has another meaning. They feel that a Protestant, going among them with the regalia of their own Church, is no other than a Protestant Jesuit who is trying to deceive them. Therefore they hold him in contempt and suspicion and, in some instances, where ignorance plays its part, they look upon the cross, pictures and vestments in the Episcopal Church as a profanation and mockery of the sacred things of their own worship. In the case above referred to, they broke in, not as covetous thieves, but to save their venerated objects from being profaned by heretics.

From what we have already said, and there is much more which we could say, the opposition of the Catholic party to the Panama Congress, on the ground that it would open a bridgeless "chasm" between them and Rome, is unfounded and absurd. This chasm has already been opened ages since, and the only way to close it is for the Catholic party to return as penitents to the bosom of Mother Church.

Looking at the subject from this point of view, we heartily congratulate the Board of Missions for its attitude, considering that it does not mean so much an approbation of the Congress

as a successful blow delivered against the enemy of the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has been hiding in its own bosom. It is also a satisfaction to know, through "The Chronicle," that Dr. Manning and those of his way of thinking form only a very small minority, and we are glad that this incident has helped to warn the great majority to be on the alert and use more energetic measures if they wish to hold their principles invulnerable.

My reasons for protesting against the Panama Congress are that I believe it to be uncalled for, having no message for the Spanish-speaking peoples, and therefore it must be prejudicial rather than helpful to the cause of Christ in Latin America.

If the leaders of this movement had planned a conference to be held in this country, or anywhere outside of Latin America, to which should be called as many as possible of the missionaries from the field, representing all denominations, for the purpose of giving each other the benefit of their experience and determining upon a uniform policy to be observed, which, while not organically uniting the different Christian bodies, would tend to harmonize and increase the efficiency of their labor—if this were done, I should be in favor of the conference with all my heart.

But what is the object of the Panama Congress? So far I have not been able to find any one to answer this question satisfactorily to me. The promoters of it have nominally organized committees, or sub-committees, in different South American countries. These committees seem to be as ignorant of the object of the Conference as I am; and the reason is that such a Congress is useless and its promoters have proved themselves very ignorant as to the mind and character of the Spanish-speaking people. Should they have more knowledge of the peculiarities of these races they would never have entertained the thought of holding a Congress such as that they propose.

This is where Protestants generally fail—in lack of tact and diplomacy when dealing with the Roman Catholic peoples. Such a Congress ought never to be held in Panama or on the mission field, because to the more intelligent natives it appears ridiculous and presumptuous. They can have little respect for ministers who divide their time between religious conferences and sight-seeing. And such a manifestation, in spite of all the efforts

of the leaders to the contrary, will arouse the antagonism of Romanists, as has been proven by the fact that Roman Catholic bishops in different parts of South America are already using it as a means of stirring up their people to a more violent opposition to Protestant missions.

On the other hand, as the leaders of the Congress have been so careful to change its name from "Latin-America Missionary Conference" to "Congress on Christian Work in Latin America," and have forbidden anything to be said or done which might in any way offend the Roman Church, all discussion of the practical problems of missionary work in South America is precluded, because the work of the evangelical missionary is necessarily opposed to Romanism. That the uselessness of the Congress, in the form now proposed by its leaders in this country, is keenly felt by many of the missionaries in South America, can be attested by letters in our possession, and a leaflet published in English, being a translation from *"El Estandarte Evangelico,"* a weekly published by the mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Buenos Aires and the official organ of the East South American Annual Conference of the M. E. Church. This leaflet, signed by the Rev. Daniel Hall, editor of *"El Estandarte,"* has been sent to us with the request that we give it the greatest publicity possible. In it Mr. Hall protests against the change of attitude of the leaders of the Congress, and gives a long list of names of those missionaries and Christian workers in Argentine who, in view of this change, have resigned from the appointments on the Congress they had at first accepted. Among these names is that of Dr. J. F. Thompson, a Methodist missionary who, as we are informed, was "the first man to preach the Gospel in Spanish in the continent of South America. He has been preaching for fifty years and is the man who has done the most for the evangelization of these peoples. He bore the burden when there was danger of losing one's life for preaching the pure Gospel in these nations." The Rev. P. Besson, a Baptist minister, is another man greatly esteemed for his Biblical studies and writings. Other names are those of both native and American missionaries who have had long years of experience, Bible Society agents, editors and writers. Not least among them is Daniel Hall himself, a native of Argentine,

brought up a Romanist, but, being brought to a knowledge of the truth twenty-five years ago, he has devoted himself to Christian work in preaching as well as writing, "having written more books and pamphlets than any other man in South America." In sending out the leaflet above mentioned, it is desired to have it made known that the Argentine Republic will not be well represented at the Panama Congress.

The action taken by the missionaries we have named did not arise from any un-Christian spirit of bigotry, but because they saw that the leaders of the Congress had placed themselves in a position so ambiguous that they could not be true to their own convictions and not protest against it. In a private letter I have in my possession it is asserted that the agents of the leaders of this Congress in Argentine are criticizing the doctrines of the pure Gospel as medieval and recommending the adoption of "modern methods." Having been asked by one of the missionaries what was meant by "modern methods," the answer was that they were the ones used in the United States and practised by Roosevelt when he visited Buenos Aires; that is, in one day he visited the Y. M. C. A., the Carmelite Convent and the horse races!

Such half-way Christianity can bring no convincing message to the Latin-American people.

The Spanish character may be divided into three classes: First, atheists, who will have nothing to do with anything that has a shadow of religion. Second, the indifferent, who follow the Church merely for the sake of social standing and outward appearance; to these Protestantism will always appear unreasonable, ridiculous and plebeian. To the third class belong those who are truly religious and who are inwardly yearning for the realization of their spiritual ideals in life. These are so dissatisfied with the exterior pomps of their Church and the avarice and unworthiness of their priests, that they are looking for something better. Only a devoted and consecrated man with a true message from the word of God can win their hearts. So the "modern methods" referred to will never win success among the Spanish-speaking peoples. If the leaders of the proposed Congress have no better message to give, they would help the cause of Christian missions far better by staying at home.

POISONED WELLS

BY ALSA LORRAINE.

(Concluded.)

Now that we come nearer home, what other objections are there to convents? Read on—and yet it is only the beginning. Here is a convent of another class or type. My first introduction to a convent in this country was also to a cloister, but a cloister from which all warmth and poetry had fled; it was more fit for a barracks than anything else, and it was run under strict rule. To tell the truth, I can remember very little religion in it, but lots of fun. After the day, when the great door closed on me with a bang and I lay on the floor in an agony of speechless grief, I became something colder than indifferent. I, naturally critical, began to observe and pull to pieces my surroundings. I reasoned then, and since have found I was quite right, that the convent's real mission was to impress the world and *society*—in big letters—with its austerity and sanctity, but primarily to cater to the rich. The girls, *certain girls,* dared to do anything. Discipline, though it existed in form, meant nothing, for the nuns were never supposed to know anything much of what was going on; for, let me add, by way of explanation, no one was received within those walls without a substantial backing of pocket-book and reference. I was taken away from this school for the very slow progress I seemed to make in my studies. I really do not recall anything much along these lines, except "penance class," where the mischievous girls generally tried to go for the fun there was in it.

"How much have you?" is the all-important question in the too numerous American convents. Sometimes a girl thought to have mediocre wealth was discovered in time to have an abundance of it, and vice versa. The resulting embarrassment was frequently sport to the girls who could appreciate the situation.

Another point, and a very essential one, the menace to the health is very great. My private teacher in mathematics was a consumptive in the extremely advanced stage. I had to sit close by her, and the memory is so painful I do not wish to dwell on it. It is well known that consumption carries off most nuns, and a great many convent girls, though perhaps this latter fact is not

so well known. Perhaps few mothers have considered the effect of convent fare on the stomach. I speak as one who knows. I never saw fresh fruit from the day I entered till the day I left (save when I went home), with but this one exception: When we were invited to a neighboring parish, for the day, one orange and one apple were set at each girl's plate. Buckwheat cakes, hash, cold fried eggs, half-warmed slices of meat, potatoes and an occasional vegetable were the regime; I might include a soup so weak and so flat the girls poured vinegar into it to give it a taste. At four o'clock an immense waiter was passed, from which was served bread covered with molasses, frequently so old as to be hard as rock and rank in musty odor. So often, in fact, did this happen the girls finally refused to eat and begged for dry bread instead. This was not given, for, failing the molasses, the bread would speak for itself. As a result, nothing was passed, and perhaps this remains the present custom. The first roasts and first fowls I ate at home found no sympathy with such an unprepared stomach. After any of these. I was invariably taken ill, a thing that very frequently results from such food with convent-bred girls.

Apart from French, Latin, music, painting and drawing, the latter consisting entirely of copying by tracing-paper (I know whereof I speak, as I took the lessons myself), I do not recall any extras, but this fact stands out very clearly in my memory,—if ever an itinerant professor chanced our way to demonstrate some new method of teaching, we were ushered into the classroom for a lesson and then at once given a half-holiday, during which time we were advised to remember our "dear parents"; but the advice so often fell on deaf ears, the holiday was later changed to letter-writing day, and we were instructed to tell our "dear parents" the new study we had taken up, nay, more, that we had a professor and the new methods in vogue. Needless to say, we never saw the same professor twice; we looked for his coming, but we looked in vain, and the girls would quote from Tennyson: "He cometh not!" One of these able gentlemen was a professor of philosophy, one of botany, one of history, another of singing, and still another of dancing and calisthenics; this last we practised by spurts and starts for a couple of dozen times, when a nun could be found to play the particular exercise. This

was an impediment, however, for when the nun who most frequently strummed Sousa's Grand March was taken ill and died, we never heard of the calisthenics again all the years I was there.

A time came when I found myself to be quite an important factor in the school. The French play had nothing to do with it, for that accompanied my final exit. I did not spring into prominence until my fourth year. No reasoning could satisfactorily account for this. I heard a quick-witted Irish girl remark: "It is fine to come back to visit the convent after being married and boss the nuns around after having been bossed by them all our lives." I experienced something of this sensation at the time I speak of. I did not try the bossing, but it was practically the same thing. Everything I did was "clever," my tastes were consulted, I was "cautioned" not to attend rosary unless I felt so disposed, etc., etc., and as I had not become a convert the only earthly explanation I could give was they must have begun to *like me*. Poor innocent idiot that I was! The real reason for the change never dawned on me till years after. Mamma had written a number of letters telling me of the place I should fill in society; that I should be careful of my associates and look forward on leaving to a long European trip, after a course in the French convent, etc., etc., and the General Directress had invariably brought me the letters "with her own hands."

Therefore I say, until a girl is sixteen and able to care for herself and stand her own ground, never send her to a convent, and do not do so even then if you are wise. Please keep in mind that this convent was of no mean order, as convents go. There were some very intellectual nuns in it, whose methods of teaching were most extraordinary, especially in matters spiritual, where they might at least be supposed to be the most at home and sure of their ground. It was a remarkable fact, they never liked to be asked a question or to illustrate any one point, spiritual or profane. Yet they would always give some answer, however wide the mark. The fact that they were entirely wrong, even on dogmatic subjects and moral theology, made not the slightest difference. Like an open water spout, their knowledge gushed regardless, *i. e.*: "Sister, can a priest marry?" "Certainly not! It is blasphemous—such a thought!" "Why," I asked, "can a priest not marry?" "Because the Bible says so."

"Where do you find it, sister?" "A priest once, a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec! You ask too many questions, child—silence!" "But," I continued, in my disagreeably persistent and irrepressible way, "I fail to see the connection—could you tell me if there is another verse in the Bible bearing more directly on the subject?" "Why, Christ said so." "But where? Would you object to giving me the chapter and verse?" "Well, I cannot recall the precise chapter and verse, but I know Christ says a priest must not marry." Again: "Sister, can priests read the Index books?" "Certainly, child." "Why?" "So they may be in a position to forbid others." "Oh!" No one could get back at this argument.

My French teacher was an Irish "baroness," generally understood to have belonged to the old aristocracy, the cream of Irish blood. In fact, all that could be said was said to make up for the remarkable brogue that would flow with such sentences as these: "Is it for *paynuts* (peanuts) and *poi* (pie) that you're going?" or, "Yer ded." The girls called her: "Your dead." Our class teacher was regarded as a very intelligent woman and one who need never have entered the convent, for she "could have married." This heralding of any great qualities was generally a suspicious omen, as it proved to be in this case. She was a vulgarian of a pronounced type, as was made manifest in her second greeting to me: "You bold brass piece of goods! You'll not find sixteen servants to wait on you in *this* place!" This invective was called forth by my innocently asking a passing nun for a teaspoon at the table. Our "angel" of recreation was a dear little nun, who was too gentle and harmless, and too unsophisticated for criticism, having entered at sixteen and remained sixteen at thirty. The directress, who thought I feared no one, but who terrorized me, was a doctor's daughter, and in some part of her interesting lectures, when she felt it incumbent on her to sit in state and instruct the girls, she never failed to recall her father's profession. She carried herself with crushing dignity and was a splendid walking advertisement for the school. I was extremely careful to slip out of her way, if I saw her coming, for I instinctively felt there was no great love lost between us. I was a *Protestant* and therein lay the discord; moreover, she never failed to remind me of it in these selfsame harangues, usually in a more highly colored way

as a *"black* Protestant," consequently an all-absorbing worry to her, as she frequently remarked, one whose destiny was already sealed and boded no good to herself or anybody else. She was everlastingly having dreams about me, too, which gave her great concern, for in them I was always the scapegoat. The description I here give is so accurate that if any nun or schoolmate were to read it she would at once know of which convent I am writing. I gathered little from these lectures except that we were never to speak against our Alma Mater; she had sufficient reason for warning us. "'Tis a dirty bird that fouls its own nest," was usually the summing up. I can still recall the shock I received, when I first heard her launch this axiom to the four corners of the room. "Cap fit, cap wear" was another to prevent the girls from becoming too much roused over some of her stinging remarks. The Reverend Mother General, that is, the head of the whole order (she looked like a bull pup) was seldom known to speak, *never,* I might say, before the girls. Her greatest wisdom lay in knowing how to hold her tongue. A true disciple of Thomas á Kempis, she had learned that "no one can safely appear in public except he who loves silence."

Two years after I became a Catholic. How did it happen? The nuns and girls said the moon would turn black and the stars would fall first. Well, we cannot discuss it here. But warring blood in me and a mind tending to the analytical saved the day. The questions that were forever bobbing uppermost and would not be downed caused a Jesuit to exclaim: "You are a very dangerous woman!" and another from whom I was receiving instruction said: "You are dangerous; you want to know too much, and you know too much already." This was in reference to some of the early Catholic manuscripts and casuistry. Protestants think of the nuns very often as innocent children of nature; one would never think they could become tainted by such a worldly vice as deceit. It is a worldly vice—granted; but deceit is a thing which springs from the heart and only a corrupt heart can produce it; therefore when this is characteritstic of collective bodies, separated from the world, we know the trouble must come from a centre—a rotten core—which permeates all.

[THE END.]

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XLVI.

Dear Cardinal:

In my last letter I said that there can be no lasting peace on earth so long as the Jesuits are allowed to exist. I am glad that my views are supported by popes, cardinals, bishops and the most prominent men of your Church.

But why are the Jesuits such enemies of public peace? Because of the object of their order, as we have already pointed out, and also because of the moral laxitude of their teachings. We must not forget that whatever other obnoxious object Loyola may have had in view, his openly avowed object in founding the order was the subjugation of the world to its power, "for the greater glory of God." How he intended to accomplish this purpose nobody knows. Such was the secrecy he zealously observed that the pope and cardinals were alarmed. Was he going to turn over to the Church the full dominion of the world, after he had accomplished its conquest? Or was he going to proclaim himself the universal ruler? He would not say. And it was only when the pope threatened him with the abolition of the order that he yielded so far as to write down the Constitutions or rules.

But there is no one who knows anything about these Constitutions who does not realize that Loyola employed the most ingenious trickery in the framing of them. Appearing to subject himself to the Church as its servant, he was in reality as free from any subjection after the writing of the Constitutions as before. They mean absolutely nothing! The general can modify them at will, and they are to the order as much of a dead letter as the Bible is to the Church.

The Jesuits, then, having succeeded in entrenching themselves so firmly, began their stupendous task by unscrupulously employing all means conducive to the end they had in view. They saw that nothing could be accomplished unless first of all a complete revolution in people's ways of thinking could be effected. So Loyola and his companions began to fill the minds of the youths they could get hold of with the most strange ideas. Everything was praiseworthy, even the most vile action, provided it successfully accomplished the

desired end. But the responsibility rested upon the individual; so in order to relieve the subject of this sometimes terrifying burden and to avoid the possibility of failure, submissive obedience was pointed out as the only way. They could easily foster these teachings among themselves, but they soon encounterd the opposition of the different schools of theology and also that of the State. It was necessary, then, to extend the influence of their teachings in a subtle and imperceptible way to those outside the order. So the classroom, pulpit and press were selected for this purpose, and soon the whole community was unwittingly imbibing their carefully disguised sophistry.

Although the Constitution forbids any member of the order to accept any ecclesiastical dignity, the Jesuits have tried, since the earliest days of their existence, to control the Church, so as to give authority to their doctrines and to secure freedom of action for themselves. The opposition they met everywhere would have made this impossible for them, were it not that by their cunning and intrigues they made themselves necessary to the papacy. So, by employing means which no one else would employ, they succeeded in reaching the high place of power they coveted; and although their abuse of this power obliged the pope to banish them forever, they, boldly disregarding his anathemas, went to Russia, Poland and Prussia, secretly invaded Germany and from there came over to the United States, and finally they made things so difficult for the Church that another pope, disregarding the bull and the infallibility of his predecessor, reinstated them, calling them the "only rowers who could bring the ship of the Church to safety" in the midst of troublous times. They themselves had agitated the Governments of Europe against the Church, in order to have the glory of being the arbitrators. They always instigate war in order to make peace on their own terms.

From what we have said our readers can see how dangerous to the peace of any land the Jesuits are. We have heard again and again that they cannot do in the United States what they have done in other countries. I would urge every good citizen, lover of the liberty of this country, to consider

that it is safer to act in this matter than to lie back in apathy. The Jesuits have contributed toward changing the character of nations more than any other influence we know of. They are not employing in the United States any different methods from those they have made use of in other lands, and they are almost sure of the results. But, either some of our citizens care very little about our future, or they are ignorant of the history of your Church. It is time to uncover to the people your methods and doctrines, and I can assure Americans that if the Jesuits have destroyed the peace of the world, the United States is not going to be an exception, unless measures are taken to prevent it before it is too late.

There is nothing more contrary to the spirit of our Constitution, our laws and our national character than the doctrines and methods of your Church; nevertheless, you have taken advantage of this spirit and character to further your aims. If some years ago the Church had displayed her true character and made known her ambition, her present vantage ground would never have been gained. But in the name of American liberty you demanded hospitality and freedom to worship in your own way, and to-day when this hospitality and freedom have been amply granted to you, you are trying by missions to non-Catholics and by other means not so open and legitimate, to convert the Protestants, and you call bigoted those who justly oppose, in the name of freedom, your aggression upon the liberties of others.

I am afraid that the day is not far distant when we shall have no peace in this country. I can see it because of my experience. When you preach the doctrine of "peace at all costs" and of "unpreparedness," then it is when you are getting ready to fight. The day will come—I only pray the people may realize it and prevent it—when no Protestant will have any hope of holding a public office, save at the cost of his religion. It is practically so, or nearly so, now. It is said that Cleveland made E. D. White Justice of the Supreme Court for the sake of the Catholic vote. William McKinley, to please Archbishop Ireland, who gave him the Catholic vote, made J. McKenna Justice of the Supreme Court. We know how Roosevelt boasts of the fact that, even when he

was only Police Commissioner, Father Wall asked him to put two young men on the police force, and he secured the appointment of something between twenty-five and thirty young men belonging to this Father's church. Of course, when he was Governor, and afterward President, the Catholic employees were counted by the thousands. Now, does Mr. Roosevelt believe that if his desire of having a Catholic President is fulfilled, he would get a Government position? No, not unless he looks for some Father to baptize him.

You know, Cardinal, that the Church conquered the nations of Europe by war. The present European War, I hope, will prevent the Church from planning any war of conquest in this country. I know that more than once the plan of complicating the United States has been proposed, but the fear that some power, we might say England, would destroy the success of such plans has held the Vatican intriguers in check.

We are going to have very sad experiences, nevertheless. As soon as we have a Catholic President, we shall have no peace. Uness the whole nation turns Catholic, which will not happen, an anti-clerical party must necessarily be formed, and every election will record bloodshed. Even in Europe, from the bosom of the Church has long since risen such a party, and to-day they are fighting everywhere to obtain such liberties as the American people are willingly according to you. But when Americans are compelled to bear your yoke, then things will change.

The Gary system in the public schools is only an experiment on the part of the Jesuits. Nothing can be calculated to more effectively destroy peace and unity in this country than such an innovation. If it should meet with general approval, the Jesuits would know how to turn it to their advantage. They would inculcate the spirit of partisanship among the pupils. We should have fights every day, and the good Fathers, for the sake of keeping the dear children and young people away from such an atmosphere, would fill the parochial schools with them; and after a little while they would say, "As Jews and Gentiles do not want our children, the Government should make an appropriation out of its

funds for the parochial schools," and everybody would think it reasonable.

But we do not have to wait to see the result. We have the case of School 45 right here in New York. The Jesuits know the influence the city exercises throughout the United States. The results obtained in New York may foretell the results of such a system all over our land. That was why the system was put to test here. The Jesuits, as they usually do, apparently kept themselves out of it, and put in charge of the Catholic children an ignorant priest, willing to follow instructions. The first effect of the system has been, not an improvement in the behavior of the children, which might be naturally expected when they are receiving daily religious instruction, but the immediate awakening of a party spirit. Rhymes like this are shouted by the children:

"Catholic, Catholic, ring the bell;
Lutheran, Lutheran, go to hell!"

And, of course, this brings into quick activity fists and stones and other weapons, causing no little trouble. Does this not show what the future will be?

But there is more to tell. The Catholic teachers, obedient to the Church, turned the free choice of religious instruction to naught by obliging the Italian children to go to the priest against their will, and in many instances against the will of their parents. Such a course would in future bring many parents and teachers into conflict, because the Church claims authority over all baptized persons, and of course, as the Catholics gain in power they will bring to bear greater pressure to enforce their laws.

Pius IX. wrote the 7th of August, 1873, to the German Emperor: ". . . Every one who has been baptized belongs in one way or another to the pope . . ." That this doctrine is taught in this country we can see by the text-books used in the parochial schools and seminaries. The "Manual of Moral Theology," by the Jesuit Father, Thomas Slater, is the text-book chosen by Cardinal Farley, whose *imprimatur* it bears. In vol. I, page 93, we read that "men become subject to the Church by Christian baptism, and so all baptized persons are subject to the laws of the Church. Heretics and

schismatics, who are validly baptized, are, *per se,* subject to the Church laws." This is the same doctrine which was taught in China and India by the Jesuits two centuries ago and which caused so much trouble there. With the pretext of practising medicine, they would go to visit the sick and surreptitiously draw a damp cloth over the patient's face, or sprinkle it with water, murmuring the formula of baptism, and then claim him as a subject of the Church. As soon as the Governments of those countries took notice of their encroachments, they threatened that the European powers would come to protect the papal subjects. Later, on account of restrictions which the Governments succeeded in enforcing, the individual had to give some sign of acceptance of baptism. Then the Jesuits practised other tricks. A little medicine would put the patient in a dying condition, whereupon they would promise relief through baptism and the patient would easily yield to the ceremony. Of course, in the majority of cases the person, after recovery, would not pay any attention to the priests or the Church, but the advantage of Rome lay in the fact that, by this act of mock baptism, the Jesuits claimed the right to instruct the children of those so baptized, and could bring to bear their influence upon the rising generation.

Rome claims the right to educate all baptized children everywhere in a Christian country, and how much more where there is religious tolerance! Only the Church, it is claimed, has the right to educate the children, and this even against the will of their parents. This proposition you and all theologians defend. This makes the union of Church and State a necessity, as the Church needs to enforce its laws in this respect, which it is impossible to do without the help of the State, working with the Church, by using force and imposing penalties upon the parents who would resist the Church. This is a very complicated treatise in canon law which very few Catholics know about and which has caused many conflicts between the Church and Governments, but we have no time or space to discuss it now.

From the above, our readers may have an idea of the complications the Gary system may bring about. We do not think it will be adopted, but we are sure of this—that if the

Jesuits cannot carry out their schemes in one way they will try another. They have eighty per cent. of the teachers; they know that their future depends on the education of the youth of the land. They will stop at nothing to achieve the accomplishment of their aims. MANUEL FERRANDO.

"An organization like the Roman Catholic Church, so powerful, so vast, so cunning, so unscrupulous, hesitating at nothing in the pursuance of her aims; and yet so specious, so fair-spoken and so insidious, is not an enemy to be despised."—Papal Conquest, page 5.

"It is, in my opinion, an entire mistake to suppose that theories like those, of which Rome is the centre, are not operative on the thoughts and actions of men. An army of teachers, the largest and most compact in the world, is ever sedulously at work to bring them into practice. Within our own time they have most powerfully, as well as most injuriously, altered the spirit and feeling of the Roman Church at large; and it will be strange indeed if, having done so much in the last half century, they shall effect nothing in the next. I must avow, then, that I do not feel the same security for the future as for the present. Nor can I overlook indications which lead to the belief that even in this country, and at this time, the proceedings of Vaticanism threaten to be a source of some practical inconvenience. I am confident that if a system so radically bad is to be made or kept innocuous, the first condition for attaining such a result is that its movements should be carefully watched, and, above all, that the bases on which they work should be faithfully and unflinchingly exposed."—Vaticanism, by W. E. Gladstone, page 16.

ROME IN POLITICS

Maneuvering for Presidential Campaign—Gloved Hand of Papacy Seen in Location of National Conventions

BY STAFF CORRESPONDENT OF FREE PRESS DEFENSE LEAGUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The sending of the Democratic National Convention to St. Louis and the Republican Convention to Chicago are signal and extraordinary triumphs for the Roman Catholic political machine. The hand of the papacy was so perfectly concealed in these master strokes that even the members of the national committees, who played into that hand, were hardly aware of the hidden influence that steered the conventions into those greatest Roman Catholic strongholds in the Middle West.

But Rome is supremely determined to secure a firm grip on the next national administration, and she knew both St. Louis and Chicago are full of militant Catholics who are well disciplined and easily subservient to the adroit leadership of politicians who serve the Roman Catholic power.

It has been apparent here at the national capital for several weeks that the location of these great conventions which will nominate the presidential tickets and make the party platforms was regarded by the cleverest politicians as matter of overshadowing importance.

Advocates of woman suffrage presented to Congress on the first day of the session a petition signed by half a million voters, including seventeen governors and many of the foremost citizens of the nation, asking for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the Constitution. The now powerful temperance forces of the country are also here in an organized and determined effort to have a prohibition amendment submitted.

Demonstrations of strength by both these great movements have been unusually spectacular, and have fairly dazzled the local public. But it has been manifest all the while that to seasoned politicians here the importance of both appeared secondary to that of locating the conventions. Covert remarks have not been wanting among those well skilled in big

politics that the prohibition and suffrage measures will be deferred till the closing days of the session and then lost in the hurried shuffle at the end.

But the location of the national conventions has deeply absorbed those who figure prominently in national politics, especially those from the great Catholic cities.

The convention delegation that came here from St. Louis whispered suavely into the ears of the Democratic committee that the party was in danger of losing Missouri in the election unless the convention were held in their city. Likewise did the Chicago delegation admonish the Republican committee of the danger of losing Illinois if the convention should not be held in the City of the Lakes.

The very absurdity of both these warnings ought to have disclosed the sinister motives back of them. Every politician knows that if the democracy cannot carry Missouri without the stimulus of the national convention that party cannot retain the presidency; and if it takes the national convention to hold Illinois in the Republican column, then that party might as well retire from the field.

The real incentive for holding the conventions in those cities was not to secure the influence of the conventions on the local communities, but to secure the influence of the local communities on the conventions. It was manifestly not necessary to hold the Republican convention in Chicago to save Illinois. But it was of vital importance to make the convention feel the presence of a million Roman Catholics in that great city and a third of a million more in rural parts of the State; and similar conditions obtained in St. Louis.

Rome well understands the power of the local community in shaping the policy of a delegate convention. That power defeated Seward at Chicago in the Republican convention of 1860 and gave the nomination to Lincoln, then the idol of Illinois Republicans. Because of this power of local environment the papal and liquor interests have usually selected Chicago and St. Louis as the convention cities in the last score of years.

In 1892, when Chicago had begun to acquire an immense Catholic population, Rome depended on that population in

her eleventh-hour endeavor to prevent the renomination of President Harrison in that city; but in that instance she was disappointed and had to defeat him at the polls in the general election. She was again disappointed in that city four years later when the meteoric cross-of-gold speech stampeded the Democratic convention to Mr. Bryan. But half a million Catholics have settled in Chicago since that time, and the political atmosphere of that city and of St. Louis is now a mighty factor in the handling of a national convention.

Prior to the Civil War Democratic national conventions were frequently held in the South. But the colossal tide that has in recent years poured millions of Catholics into our country from southeastern Europe has flowed almost exclusively into the northern and central States. While the population, especially the city population, of these States has become saturated with this infusion, the inhabitants of the solid South remain overwhelmingly Protestant.

For that reason the Tammany machine in New York, the Sullivan machine in Illinois, and their like in the other great northern cities and States cannot trust the democracy to hold a national convention in any city of the far South. And similar papal machines in the other party halt at the same danger. Citizens of Dallas and the committee that came here to represent them seem not to have understood this when they put up large sums of money and made a gallant and honest fight for the conventions.

Alarmed at the growing power of the patriotic press and the consequent arousal of patriotic sentiment and activity throughout the nation, Rome appreciates the vital importance of making the next occupant of the White House feel deeply that he holds the presidency by the grace of Roman Catholic politicians and the votes which they control. This, together with the largest possible measure of power in the next Congress, is the one desideratum to which all other purposes and movements are now being subordinated.

With the tactical skill that has characterized the papacy for more than a thousand years, criminal prosecutions are being conducted against patriotic journals and their editors as a feint to harass and intimidate those publications and divert

public attention, while all necessary maneuvers are perfected to control the coming presidential election. Thus will the Catholic forces be able to handle the administration, including the post-office department, to exclude the patriotic press from the mails and dominate or destroy all avenues and instrumentalities that disseminate the news and shape public sentiment.

WHAT A JESUIT SAYS AND WHAT HE DOES NOT SAY

The following report was published by "The New York Times." It is important in that it shows the Jesuitical way of putting things so as to mislead people. We do not doubt that Father McMahon is an attractive speaker, and that many were taken in by his eloquence, but from what he said, did they come out of the conference with a clearer mind on the subject discussed?

Let us see what Father McMahon said according to the reporter:

"That war should be considered from a moral point of view and that it was not inherently evil, but might be highly virtuous, were contentions made by the Rev. Dr. Joseph H. McMahon in speaking on 'Catholicism and War' before the Catholic Library Association at Delmonico's yesterday afternoon. Father McMahon condemned both pacifists and militarists as immoral and asserted that President Wilson's expression, 'Too proud to fight,' had a pagan and not a Christian origin. He also said that war, to be just, must be conducted according to the Ten Commandments.

" 'War is the assertion or vindication or defense of moral right by armed might,' he said. 'This elevates war to the plane of morality. It is a fundamental law of individuals and of States that each has certain moral rights, such as the right of self-defense and the right to use physical force to assert, vindicate or defend its moral rights.

" 'War, therefore, must be decided upon a moral plane, and in a moral act there are three things to consider—the character of the moral act is determined, first, by its origin, its cause;

second, by the intention behind it, and, third, by the way in which it is carried out. To be morally right the act must be just in all three of these points. If it is unjust in origin, it is an unjust act, no matter what may be the intention of it or the way in which it is carried out. Likewise, if the intention is unjust or if the manner in which it is conducted is unjust, the act is unjust.

" 'In distinguishing between just and unjust wars the Church makes it clear that there are just wars, and there is divine support for such a position. The very name of God among the Hebrews of the Old Testament indicates that there is justness in war. While God is the Prince of Peace, He is also the Lord of Hosts, and the Jehovah of the Jews was a God of battle. In the Old Testament we have accounts of wars undertaken at the behest of God Himself, and there can be nothing inherently immoral in the idea of war if God Himself has directed His people to fight.

" 'And the teaching in the New Testament supports the position. When John the Baptist gave counsel to the soldiers he did not rebuke them for being soldiers, but insisted that in their soldiery there should not be the slightest injustice. Christ, likewise, did not reprove the centurion for being a soldier, but praised him for his faith. The early Christians often continued to be soldiers in the armies of the Cæsars. All of these things show that war is not intrinsically and inherently immoral.

" 'But a war to be moral must be just. It must spring from just causes, it must have just motives, and there must be justice in the pursuit of the war. The Catholic Church has never recognized the acquisition of territory as a just motive for war, and the Church has always condemned the Gospel of Culture as supplying an unjust motive for war. For a nation to fight another because it wants international trade may be a just cause of war, and it may be unjust. There is no moral right, however, that recognizes that one nation must be superior to another nation, that one nation must spread or expand.

" 'The Catholic Church teaches that the sinking of an unarmed merchant ship, and, by this act, the drowning of noncombatants, is not an act of war, but an act of murder. War must be carried out in a civilized manner, not in a barbarous fashion. No character of exigency, no character of military necessity, can be an excuse for the violation of the principles of

the Ten Commandments. Acts of war must be judged not as acts of war, but by the moral principles that apply to both peace and war.

"'In conclusion I want to repeat what I said in the beginning—that war is not inherently evil, and that it must be judged on a moral plane. And I want to say that the Church condemns the militarist who places war itself, regardless of the moral questions involved, on a high plane. Also the Church condemns the pacifist who says that war is inherently immoral. There is no justification for militarism. It is false in theory and it is false in fact. And the extreme pacifist—the man for peace at any price—is equally immoral. Recently the expression, "Too proud to fight," has been much used. This expression is not from the Gospel, not from Catholic teaching, but from Paganism. It is not a Christian doctrine.'

"Father McMahon said that true virtue was always the mean and never the extreme, and he repeated that the mean between extreme militarism and extreme pacificism was the virtuous position for the State."

From what Father McMahon says, in order to determine on which side lies the moral right for war, we must have a competent judge. He does not say who this judge ought to be. We know that the ruler of a neutral power is not competent, because he has no infallibility; our President, because he lacks this gift, has made the mistake of falling into a "pagan idea." That shows that the question of competency to judge on this important matter is a very delicate one, and we have to look to an individual divinely endowed with supernatural power. The Church teaches that the pope is the only one divinely appointed to judge all questions of morals. Then Father McMahon ought to tell us so plainly, unless for some Jesuitical purpose he has seen fit to allow us to draw our own conclusions.

The present European conflict has certainly shown the pope to be a very poor judge of the morals of warfare. He has been weeping all the time and lamenting, but he has not seen fit yet to tell us which one of the belligerent nations has the moral right to fight. His priests are fighting on either side. Some of them must be right and some must be wrong, or, to use the words of Father McMahon, some must be "moral" and some

"immoral," some animated by the Christian spirit and some by the "pagan idea." Yet all the priests are furnished with the papal blessing and special privileges. How can we know which side is right? It cannot be possible that *all* are right, even though they may think so.

The Church teaches that a priest performing mass in a state of mortal sin, not only commits sacrilege, but makes all his hearers incur in the sin of idolatry. Besides, there is the problem of valid absolution, etc. Now, we cannot believe that a priest fighting "immorally" (that is, on the wrong side) can help but fall into the awful sins referred to, dragging others with him, and the pope, for the sake of so many perishing souls, ought to speak, and speak clearly.

We can find only the following reasons for his silence. Either he does not believe in the doctrines of the Church, in God, or the future destiny of the soul (in which case he is the greatest hypocrite that exists), or believing, he yet loves worldly power so much, and fears so much to lose it, that he prefers to be on good terms with the rulers of this world, even though it means the eternal perdition of millions of souls. In which case let the reader find a proper name for him! THE EDITOR.

"My object has been to produce, if possible, a temper of greater watchfulness: to promote the early and provident fear which, says Mr. Burke, is the mother of necessity; to distrust that lazy way of thought which acknowledges no danger until it thunders at the doors: to warn my countrymen against the velvet paw and smooth and soft exterior of a system which is dangerous to the foundations of civil order, and which any one of us may at any time encounter in his daily path."—Vaticanism, by W. E. Gladstone, page 117.

SIX HUNDRED UNHAPPY HOMES

There are more than 600 children in the Separate schools of Toronto, whose fathers are public school supporters.

This has been used by the representatives of the Separate school system as evidence of their generosity. When the facts are known it takes on an entirely different aspect. These 600 children come from homes where there are mixed marriages. Their fathers are Protestants and their mothers Roman Catholics. The law does not permit a Protestant to pay his taxes to the Separate schools, nor do the Protestant fathers wish to do so. The mothers of the children, however, influenced by their father confessors, insist upon the children going to the Separate schools, where they can learn the catechism.

Behind these facts there are conditions which must be regarded as deplorable. They show that in at least 600 homes in Toronto there is a serious difference of opinion between the fathers and the mothers as to the upbringing of the children. Who can estimate the measure of domestic infelicity that is produced by such a state of affairs? Is it too much to say that the bickering and quarreling that is unavoidable under such circumstances renders such homes unhappy? Neither father nor mother can have that confidence in each other that should subsist between man and wife. This lack of confidence is inevitably transmitted to the children, and instead of that domestic unity that should prevail in every well-ordered home, there is suspicion, distrust and antagonism, which it is impossible to overcome because of the vital diversity of religious views.

We pity children who are brought up in such an atmosphere. The best and sweetest things in life for them are destroyed by this disagreement between their parents. Probably there is, in some of these homes, a perfect understanding between husband and wife. That cannot be the rule, however, but rather a rare exception. It is a sad thing to think that in 600 homes of this one city of Toronto the evils of mixed marriages are to be found.

—The Sentinel.

According to the last report there were twenty-four murderers in the *death house,* Sing Sing prison. Of these, twenty were Roman Catholics.

CATHOLICISM OUR NATIONAL PERIL

The trouble with the Roman Catholic Church is that it seeks to be both a Church and a political party. Its arrogant claims of being the only true Christian Church, intolerant as they are, might be treated with indifference; but when for its head it asserts temporal power and civil authority, intruding itself by logical consequence into the political affairs of every country which it enters, a position is assumed which cannot be allowed any Church whatsoever. If it must assume such a position, its members must not complain if it is met with political opposition not offered to any other Church. This is why such great men as Gladstone, Bismarck, Juarez, Diaz, Garibaldi and the ruling statesmen of France have resisted its pretensions.

Since the Spanish-American War and the acquisition by the United States of colonies where Romanism has been the established religion, it has been more aggressive than ever in our political affairs. The peril of Romanism to our institutions is not an imaginary danger, conceived by the heated brains of fanatics; it is a real and constant menace. It must be resisted in our country, as it has been resisted in England, Germany, France, Italy, Mexico, Portugal—as it has been resisted in every country where it has secured any considerable following. If it were willing to take its place as a Church along with all the other Churches it would be improper to meet it with any other attitude than that in which we meet all the other Churches; but it is not willing to be only a Church. Putting itself in a class to itself by its political animus, it must take all that such an improper position makes inevitable; it cannot claim the political exemptions of a Church while it asserts political claims as well as churchly prerogatives.—Warren A. Chandler, Bishop M. E. Church, Atlanta, Ga.

"There is ere long to be a State religion in this country, and that religion is to be Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic is to wield his vote for this purpose."—Catholic World, New York.